

MINUTES
(Audio Recording Available)
**BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS/
ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW/SIGN REVIEW BOARD**
MEETING OF February 9, 2012
5:30 PM - LAKEWOOD CITY HALL
AUDITORIUM

A. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

1. **ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Fleenor
Michael Molinski, Chair
Carl Orban, Vice-Chair
Cynthia Stockman

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dru Siley, Secretary, Dir. of P&D
Bob Apanasewicz, Asst. Bldg. Comm., Commercial
Jeff Fillar, Asst. Bldg. Comm., Residential
Bryce Sylvester, Planner

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban, to EXCUSE the absence of Mr. Waddell. All Members voting yea, the motion passed.

3. Opening remarks.

Mr. Molinski waived the reading of the Opening Remarks.

4. Introduction of Cynthia Stockman, newly appointed Board of Building Standards/Architectural Board of Review/Sign Review member and issuance of Oath of Office.

Mr. Molinski introduced Ms. Stockman as the newest member of the Board. Mr. Sylvester administered the Oath of Office.

2. Approve the Minutes of the January 12, 2012 meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban to **APPROVE** the minutes of the January 12, 2012 meeting. All the members voting yea, the motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

BOARD OF BUILDING STANDARDS

7. **Docket 01-10-12** **R** **1077 Abbieshire Avenue**

- () Approve
- () Deny
- () Defer

John Conway
1077 Abbieshire Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

The applicant requests the review and approval to not have railings on the front porch. This item was deferred from the meeting of January 12, 2012. (Page 12)

John Conway, applicant and property owner, was present to explain the request. The house did not have railings historically when he purchased the home in 1976 nor were there railings in the archived pictures. To comply with an ordinance, he installed railings, but they did not look right as they had to angle toward the house. He did not think there was a safety issue because there were bushes around the porch. The height of the porch from

Mr. Orban noted the columns shown in the archived pictures were much larger than the existing. Mr. Conway explained he replaced the columns to match what had been there; at the time of the replacement, he did not have the archived photographs. Mr. Orban did not like the look of the railings, did not like the look of the smaller columns, and noted the archived photographs displayed planters on the porch. Mr. Conway said he could put planters across the front, but did not want them on the sides. Mr. Molinski said he wanted to see some sort of a barrier on the sides. Mr. Orban suggested wrapping the columns to make them larger. Mr. Fleenor said to make note the original columns were larger at the bottom. Ms. Stockman agreed with the larger columns and the porch planters. Mr. Molinski suggested fixing them to the porch in such a manner as to be able to move them when needed.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban, to **APPROVE** with the following stipulations:

- All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

8. Docket 11-149-11 R 12576 Lake Avenue

Drew Smith
Brad Smith Roofing Co. Inc.
24550 Sperry Road
Westlake, Ohio 44145

A written document had been received from the applicant requesting a deferral to the meeting of March 8, 2012.

9. Docket 01-04-12 R 17614 Fries Avenue

Marshall Wright
Wright Construction
8610 Madison Avenue, #3
Cleveland, Ohio 44102

Mr. Fillar, Building Department, asked the Board to deliberate on the application without the applicant being present as the contractor thought he did not have to be at the review meeting because the materials and minor change had been presented at the pre-review meeting.

Mr. Siley suggested the review of the design. The roofline of the dormer had been modified to gabled end and a reduced width.

There was no public comment. Mr. Fleenor stated the proposal was much improved from the last meeting; Mr. Orban concurred.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor, to **APPROVE** the application as amended. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

REQUEST FOR REHEARING SIGN REVIEW

5. Docket 08-99-11 – S

**13215 Detroit Avenue
Family Dollar Store**

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Deny
- ☐ Defer

Brad Kowit and Alan Berger
FDBTS
24100 Chagrin Boulevard
Beachwood, Ohio 44122

The applicants request the review and approval of signage for a new store. This item was denied at the meeting of January 12, 2012. (Page 4)

There was miscommunication, there was no representative at last month's meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor to **APPROVE** the request for a rehearing. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

REHEARING SIGN REVIEW

6. Docket 08-99-11 – S

**13215 Detroit Avenue
Family Dollar Store**

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Deny
- ☐ Defer

Brad Kowit and Alan Berger
FDBTS
24100 Chagrin Boulevard
Beachwood, Ohio 44122

The applicants request the review and approval of signage for a new store. This item was denied at the meeting of January 12, 2012. (Page 4)

Alan Burger, applicant, was present to explain the request. He proposed corporate Family Dollar signage on the Detroit Avenue/north side, and the Grace Avenue/east side, and a monument sign on northwest part of the property on Detroit Avenue. The Grace Avenue side sign would not be lit; the Detroit Avenue building and monument signs would be internally illuminated. Three separate cabinet signs made one sign: Family was one, Dollar was the second, and the medallion logo was the third. Mr. Fleenor objected to the internally lit cabinet signs as they did not fit with Lakewood. Mr. Berger countered they had spent a lot of time and money on the elevation to have it fit, and this was the corporate signage; they needed to retain some corporate identity. Mr. Orban said Lakewood also had an identity to retain and discussed some alternatives used by other businesses. Mr. Burger said he could propose the use of raised, individual letters/characters to corporate. The Grace Avenue side could also be raised, individual unlit letters. The monument acrylic sign would be lit during business

hours, the dimensions were seven feet wide and four feet tall (7' x 4'), and it would be placed perpendicular to the street.

Mr. Apanasewicz, Building Department, said he would need revised renderings of any approved sign package, and he noted a variance was needed due to the number of signs; the additional. Mr. Siley stated the variance regarding the number of signs had already been approved at the November 10, 2011 meeting.

There were no comments or questions from the public. However, Mr. Siley did clarify what was to be done with the signage: the color and sizes of the signs were acceptable, the monument sign was acceptable as proposed, the north elevation (Detroit Avenue) would change from three individual cabinets to individual letters and logo on a raceway to match the brick behind, and the east elevation (Grace Avenue) would have individual, non-illuminated letters and no logo.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor, to **APPROVE with the following stipulations:**

1. The color and size of the signs were to be as presented,
2. The monument sign was to be as presented,
3. The north elevation illuminated sign was to be individual letters and logo on a raceway to match the brick, and
4. The east elevation non-illuminated sign was to be individual letters with no logo.

All members voting yea, the motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

12.	Docket 02-15-12	R	1270 Beach Avenue
	() Approve		Mohammed Amawi
	() Deny		1270 Beach Avenue
	() Defer		Lakewood, Ohio 44107

The applicant requests the review and approval for the enclosing of a front porch. (Page 46)

Mohammed Amawi, applicant, wanted to enclose the porch for maintenance and security purposes. There was a basement under the porch. A couple of years ago, he had a basement waterproofing company make repairs and install a sump pump.

Mr. Molinski explained the City did not approve enclosed porches typically. Mr. Amawi noted that two houses on his street had enclosed porches, and that he did not add a wall; he simply added windows. Mr. Amawi continued the front windows were removable whereas the side windows were not. Mr. Fleenor reinforced a statement made by Mr. Amawi; that it did not look like a porch but another room. Mr. Orban stated he drove on Mr. Amawi's street and noted homes where the porches had been redone and looked beautiful. He continued that Mr. Amawi's house changed the flavor of the neighborhood on that side of the street, and the homes with the enclosed porches had been done long ago. Aside from the fact that Mr. Amawi did not get permits and/or meet with the Board for guidance, the doors were not to code as they did not have the required three foot stoop.

Mr. Fillar, Building Department, stated a full color mock-up was given after the project was built and no permits were issued, but a crawlspace and/or room under a porch was a good reason to enclose the porch. The Planning Department had no comments.

Persis Sosiak, 1275 Beach Avenue, neighbor across the street, spoke in support of the applicant.

Mr. Fleenor said the two front doors made the structure a room, not a porch. The double doors gave the feel of a 1960's split level look, and did not complement the architecture. Mr. Orban said there was room for compromise to retain the look of Lakewood, and the inoperable side windows did not accomplish that. Mr. Amawi said he was willing to work toward a satisfactory conclusion. Mr. Siley asked Mr. Fillar to verify Mr. Orban's statement about the three foot stoop. Mr. Fillar said it did not apply because the doors opened inward toward the house.

Mr. Siley said he would like to meet with Mr. Amawi and the Building Department to remedy the issue.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor, to **DEFER** the application to the meeting of March 8, 2012. All members voting yea, the motion passed.

11. **Docket 02-14-12**

**C 17884 Lake Road
The Clifton Club**

- () Approve
- () Deny
- () Defer

James A. Wallis
James A. Wallis AIA
5548 Canterbury Lane
Highland Heights, Ohio 44143

The applicant requests the review and approval of changes to the roof and gutter system. (Page 14)

James A. Wallis, applicant, was present to explain the request.

Ms. Stockman was recused from the Docket 02-14-12.

Mr. Wallis continued that there had been revisions to the submittal as a result of the pre-review meeting: revise the gutter/fascia detail, lower the parapet and expose more brick, removal of the stone cap, the addition of gutters on the mansard roof to prevent water stains., change the elevator tower to match the not yet chosen roofing material and painted to match the roofs. The other option was to change the red tile color to a slate color. He wanted to ask for bids for different roofing materials and was curious about using dimensional shingles. The Board members did not like dimensional shingles; although they did like the change of siding depth. Mr. Wallis pointed to the main connector that spanned from the garage to the main club house and said they proposed to change the siding to lap siding to match the upper proposed roof, painted dark or white to match the rear porch. Discussion continued about the roofing material; real slate or simulated slate. Regarding the windows, there were seven windows and one louvred window in the mansard roof that would be replaced; the two existing pseudo windows in the elevator tower would be maintained with either wood or Hardee board. The gutter system would be copper.

David Dashiell, 17894 Clifton Park Lane, asked for clarification about the pinkish color; if it would be repainted. Mr. Wallis replied it would be repainted, and the parapet would be rebuilt.

There were no additional comments or questions from the public. There were no comments from the Building and Planning Departments.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban, to **APPROVE with the stipulation that final materials are submitted to the Board.** Mr. Sylvester conducted a roll call vote; Mr. Fleenor replied "approved", Mr. Orban replied "yes", Mr. Molinski replied "yes", and Ms. Stockman replied "abstain". Three of the four members present voted yea, the motion passed.

SIGN REVIEW

13. Docket 12-16-12

C 13800 Detroit Avenue
Szechwan Garden

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Deny
- ☐ Defer

Hoa Lam
Szechwan Garden
13800 Detroit Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

The applicant requests the review and approval of an LED illuminated wall sign. (Page 68)

Hoa Lam, applicant, was present to explain the request. The red plastic individually mounted letters would be LED illuminated from the back. The sign board would be replaced and painted white; the same color as currently existed. Mr. Siley asked the applicant about the spelling. Mr. Lam stated there was a "Z" in Szechwan. All electrical work and raceway would be concealed behind the sign board. Ms. Stockman inquired about the sign board material. Mr. Lam said it was a type of shiny plastic.

There were no comments from the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban, to **APPROVE** as submitted. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

10. Docket 01-11-12

R 2016-18 Warren Road

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Deny
- ☐ Defer

Albert Gomez
2016 Warren Road
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

The applicant requests the review and approval of the porch column and rails which were brick. This item was deferred from the meeting of January 12, 2012. (Page 13)

Neither Albert Gomez, applicant, nor his representative, was present to explain the request. Mr. Fillar said he had not communicated with Mr. Gomez since the last meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor, to **DENY** the application. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

ADD-ON

OLD BUSINESS

REQUEST FOR REVISIONS

14. Docket 03-22-11

C 15501 Detroit Avenue
CVS Pharmacy

- ☐ Approve
- ☐ Deny
- ☐ Defer

Sean McDermott
Zaremba Group
14600 Detroit Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

The applicant requests the review and approval of revisions to building signage that was approved at the March 10, 2011 meeting. (Page 72)

Sean McDermott, applicant, was present to explain the request. He recapped the Board's decision of last year for the site plan and elevations that included many large, clear view windows along the Detroit Avenue façade but could not have clear view windows along the Arthur Avenue façade because of store room, bathrooms, and other locations that should not be visible. They chose to have window graphics appropriate to the neighborhood; high profile areas. A professional photographer came to Lakewood to photograph architectural details specific to the city. Those graphics would be displayed in five windows along Arthur Avenue and one window on the east side of the building along Detroit Avenue. The display window graphics would be adhered on the back wall of the display room; two feet, four inches from the face of the window. A clear panel with the CVS tear logo would hang one foot in front of the permanently displayed graphic. Mr. McDermott showed the proposed graphics to the Board and Staff. On the east window along Detroit Avenue would be a photograph of the gateway to Lakewood Park, and along Arthur Avenue would be photographs of an apartment building across from Lakewood Park, details of the door at the Berger Village building,, door of St. James Catholic Church, stone work on St. James and the Lakewood Masonic Temple, and Tudor detail of a house on Lake Avenue. On Arthur Avenue were to be a bus stop, downtown way-finding signage, and three autumn blaze maple trees that would act as buffers visually. From the ceiling, downwash lighting system of three or four LED lights would be in each display window. Mr. Orban thanked Mr. McDermott for his work and attention to detail. Ms. Stockman asked about the graphics. Mr. McDermott explained they would first be mounted on a foam board prior to being adhered to the back wall, and a singular clear plastic plain shield with teardrops would hang one foot in front of the graphic to give a three-dimensional effect. The fully enclosed window displays were conditioned with vents for air flow, carpeted bottoms, and doors that opened for cleaning.

There were no comments from the public. There were no comments from the Building Department. Mr. Siley asked for a condition that if there were any further changes, the applicant would have to reappear before the Board for approval; e.g. change of window graphics.

Mr. Fleenor wondered about the display windows hours of being lit. He would not object if the lights were active throughout the night. Mr. Molinski felt that could be at the discretion of the business owners with no objections from the Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Fleenor, to **APPROVE** with the following stipulations:

1. Any changes to the graphics would have to be approved by the Board, and
2. There would be no prohibition to the hours of the lighting on the graphic displays.

All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

15. **Adjourn.**

A motion was made by Mr. Molinski, seconded by Mr. Orban, to ADJOURN the meeting adjourned at 6:50 P.M. All members voting yea, the motion passed.



Signature



Date